

REMARKS

Claims 1-25, 27-32, 35-39 and 42-44 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-25, 27-32, 35-39 and 42-44.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the comments in the Office Action, which has been carefully considered. It is respectfully submitted that all issues raised are traversed, being hereinafter addressed with reference to the relevant headings appearing in the Detailed Action section of the Office Action.

The Applicant has amended the claim set. The Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claim set are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Although amendments have been made to the claims, the applicant does not concede that the pre-amended claims are not patentable in view of the cited references. The amendments are made in order to expedite allowance of the application rather than any admission of a patentability requirement necessitating the claim amendments.

35 USC 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 6, 12 to 20, 22 to 25, 27 to 30, 35 to 39 and 42 to 44 as being anticipated by Hanagan et al. Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claim 35 as being anticipated by Gangopadhyay et al.

The Applicant has amended the claims and respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections are now moot in light of these amendments.

In particular, independent claims 1, 24, 27, 32, 35, 39, 42 and 44 have been amended to specify user defined interconnections between components, wherein the interconnections define transfer of data between components. Furthermore, these claims have also been amended to specify a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed, wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component. Support for

these amendments can be found in relation claim 12 in relation to the transfer of service requests. Claim 12 has subsequently been cancelled. Further support for user defined interconnections.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are not anticipated by Hanagan et al and Gangopadhyay et al. Specifically, the Examiner rejected the subject matter of previous claim 12 in relation to Hanagan et al. The Order Processing (OP) 22 of Hanagan et al accepts work requests and determines the combination of resources needed to complete the request (see para 81 of Hanagan et al). However, the transfer of data between the combination of resources of Hanagan et al is not user defined as required by the currently amended independent claims, and therefore the claims are not anticipated by Hanagan et al. Additionally, neither Hanagan et al or Gangopadhyay et al disclose, teach or suggest a service request being transferred to each entity where the service request includes an indication of user defined interconnections of the component with one or more other components of a combination of components to perform the service, wherein the one or more interconnections define transfer of data between entities of the respective components to perform the service.

Based on the above arguments that Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as currently amended, are not anticipated by Hanagan et al and Gangopadhyay et al.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejections.

35 USC 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 7 to 11 as being unpatentable over Hanagan et al in view of Gangopadhyay et al. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 21 and 31 as being unpatentable over Hanagan et al in view of Rogole (US Patent No 7,139,728).

As previously stated, the Applicant has amended the claims and respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections are now moot in light of these amendments.

In particular, Hanagan et al, Gangopadhyay et al. and Rogole fail to disclose, in combination:

one or more user defined interconnections between at least some of the components defining transfer of data between the entities of the respective components... wherein a service request is transferred to each entity requesting the respective service portion to be performed, wherein each service request includes an indication of the interconnections of the respective component

Additionally, the Applicant notes that portions of Hanagan et al lead away from combination with Gangopadhyay et al.

Specifically, Hanagan et al discloses a customer care and billing system (see field of invention of Hanagan et al). When a customer interacts with the system to purchase a new service, the OP of the customer care and billing system which accepts the work request associated with the purchased service determines, independently of the user, the combination of resources needed to complete the request. This is due to the user being unable to define how the service is performed, particularly for a system such as a telecommunications system where internal knowledge of how components operate within the telecommunications system are unknown to the user.

In contrast, Gangopadhyay et al allows the user to define how a service is to be performed via the user using a modeling tool to graphically represent a process which includes transactions and events.

A combination of Hanagan et al with Gangopadhyay et al as Hanagan et al is directed toward a system which, independently of the user's input, determines how components interact to perform the requested service which is essential for complex systems such as a billing system for a telecommunication system, whereas Gangopadhyay et al is in total contrast as the user defines how the service is performed using the modeling tool. There would therefore be no motivation to combine Gangopadhyay et al with Hanagan et al as allowing the user to define the components to perform the service

in Hanagan et al would make little sense as the user has no understanding as to how they should interconnect.

Based on these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as currently amended, are patentable over Hanagan et al in view of Gangopadhyay et al. Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims, as currently amended, are patentable over Hanagan et al in view of Rogole.

The Applicant also notes that a number of the dependent claims in the currently presented claim set include patentable subject matter over the above-mentioned citations.

The Applicant also notes that a number of the dependent claims in the currently presented claim set include patentable subject matter over the above-mentioned citations.

In particular, the Applicant notes that there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of claim 12 which specifies the components being implemented by component processing systems, the method of implementing the combined components including:

- a) Generating the service request for each component in the component combination; and,
- b) Transferring the service request to each entity via the communications network, each entity being adapted to respond to the service request to implement the data manipulation embodied by the respective component.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the implementation of the components by the component processing systems has not been shown by above mentioned citations, and in particular by Hanagan et al which shows a single processing system having a number of implemented components. The component processing systems allow a distributed manner of implementing the service over a plurality of separate processing systems. This also allows for service portions to be specialized by each component processing system, thereby providing efficient implementation of the service.

Additionally, the Applicant notes that there is no disclosure teaching or suggestion of the subject matter of claim 16 which specifies causing each component processing system to:

- a) Implement a respective agent associated with each port; and,
- b) Cause each agent to cooperate with an agent of another component in accordance with the defined interconnections, to thereby allow data to be transferred between the ports.

The Examiner has referred to Hanagan et al as referring to standardized interfaces which the Examiner has construed as being an agent. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that the standardized interfaces can be interpreted as an agent. An agent, as claimed, cooperates with another component. The standardized interface of Hanagan et al does not cooperate with another interface of another interface based on the description of Hanagan. The Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claim 16 is patentable.

Additionally, in order to further define this distinction the Applicant has introduced new claim 47 that each agent negotiates with the agent of another component in accordance with the defined interconnections to thereby allow data to be transferred between the ports. Support for this amendment can be found at paragraph 222 of the current specification. None of the citations teach or suggest an agent which negotiates with another agent of another component. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 47 represents further patentable subject matter over the above-mentioned citations.

The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claim rejections.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant requests a Notice of Allowance of all the claims presently under examination.

Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 071896.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 9, 2009



J.D. Harriman II, Reg. 31,567

DLA Piper US LLP
1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 400
Los Angeles, California 90067-6023
Tel: (310) 595-3000
Fax: (310) 595-3300